



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,083	09/875,083 06/06/2001		Dean C. Marchand	COS-99-012	6214
25537	7590	07/01/2005		EXAM	INER
MCI, INC	STREET	NW	DEANE JR, WILLIAM J		
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•				

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/875,083	MARCHAND ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William J. Deane	2642				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI y statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	03 March 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.					
• •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,7-14,17 and 18 is/are pendid 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5,7-14 &17-18 is/are rejected 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doct 2. Certified copies of the priority doct 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International is * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No I received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	" □					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	48) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/875,083

Art Unit: 2642

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,307,926 (Barton et al.).

Barton et al. disclose a system for detection and prevention of telecommunications fraud prior to call connections. Barton et al. discloses a fraud analysis system 22, an SCP 16, an LEC and an IXC. As shown below, the databases of the IXC and LEC are mutually accessible to pass and obtain information.

With respect to claims 1, 4, 10 - 11 and 17, note Col. 7, lines 10 - 55. Note that the SCP in the IXC has a database containing originating phone numbers (note Col. 4, lines 56 - 63), with respect to "special service numbers", note the use of calling card numbers, which are usually 1-800 numbers (in addition, note the use of hotel numbers; typically 1-800). Additionally, note page 6, line 16 of the instant application). With respect to subsequent calls, note that there is a post fraudulent analysis (see Col. 6, lines 19 - 30) and pre-connect screening and FEP 200, see Col.7, lines 32 - 65. With respect to blocking, note Col. 6, lines 26 - 30, among others. With respect to providing the suspicious originating phone number to another database accessible by the LEC,

Application/Control Number: 09/875,083

Art Unit: 2642

note that the IXC provides the LEC with pre-connect fraud screening (Col. 7, lines 38 – 46) which includes originating numbers. Certainly, the LEC can access its own database. In addition, note the "alternatively and additionally" language, indicating more databases to store information (Col. 7, lines 17 – 24). Additionally, note Col. 7, lines 52 – 55, where the LEC has access to the SCP database.

With respect to claim 2, note SCPMS 18 in Fig. 1.

With respect to claims 3 and 18, note Col. 9, lines 42 – 44.

With respect to claims 8 and 9, note use of Signaling System 7 (SS7) at Col. 5, lines 43 – 45.

With respect to claim 12, note Col. 6, lines 48 – 54.

With respect to claim 14, note ARMS 20 and Col. 11, line 62 – line 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton et al. in view of the instant application.

With respect to claim 5 and "threshold", note Col. 3, lines 18 – 25 and Col. 11, line 67 – Col. 12, line 2. Using a threshold would come under "any variety of fraud screening."

Application/Control Number: 09/875,083

Art Unit: 2642

With respect to claims 7 and 13, note that Barton et al. deals with calling cards (see Col. 4, lines 39 – 42). Note that Fig. 1, which is prior art (see page 7, lines 29 – 30) and page 4, lines 1 – 13. Therefore, the limitations of claims 7 and 13 appear to be inherent in Barton et al. If this is not agreed, then certainly, the inclusion of such limitations into Barton et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as such limitations are old and well known in the art in the use of calling cards.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 5, 7 - 14 and 17 - 18 have been considered but are not deemed persuasive to any error in the rejections above.

Applicant argues in reference to, "providing the suspicious originating phone number to another database accessible by the local exchange carrier network". However, this claim is so broad because any database can be accessible by a local exchange carrier network with the right permissions. For example, a local exchange has a backup database (possible serviced by another company) that would inherently contain the suspicious originating phone number and would be accessible by the local exchange.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 09/875,083 Page 5

Art Unit: 2642

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (703) 872-9306.

27Jun05

WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.